

DRAFT MINUTES

Delta Protection Commission Meeting Thursday, January 27, 2000

1. Call to Order.

The Commission meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. Present were: Chairman McCarty, Commissioners Brean, Broddrick, Cabaldon, Calone, Coglianese, Curry, Harris, McGowan, Mello, Nottoli, Salmon, Sanders, and Shaffer. Absent were: Commissioners Canciamilla, Ferreira, Matthews, and Thomson.

2. Public Comments.

There were no public comments.

3. Minutes of Last Meeting.

Commissioner Coglianese asked the draft minutes be corrected to indicate her comments were made to BDAC, not Policy Group.

On a motion by Vice Chair Mello and a second by Commissioner Coglianese, the draft minutes as amended were approved by voice vote. Commissioners Harris and Calone abstained.

4. Chairman's Report.

Chairman McCarty announced that Commissioner Simas has left the Commission and San Joaquin County Supervisor Gutierrez has been appointed to replace Commissioner Simas. A resolution for Commissioner Simas was approved unanimously by voice vote. Chairman McCarty announced that Commissioner A. J. Yates has retired from State service, and has been replaced by Steve Shaffer as the representative of the Department of Food and Agriculture. Chairman McCarty thanked Mr. Yates for his Service to the Department of Food and Agriculture and the Delta Protection Commission.

Mr. Yates expressed his thanks to the other Commissioners for the experience of being on the Commission and thanked the Delta farmers for what he has learned from them about Delta farming, and to the other Commissioners for all he has learned about the Delta. He said he would stay active in agricultural issues.

On a motion by Commissioner Harris and a second by Commissioner Curry, the Commission unanimously approved a Resolution of Appreciation for Commissioner Yates.

Chairman McCarty noted that a Strategic Planning meeting was scheduled for February 24, 2000. The next regular meeting is scheduled for March 23, 2000.

Chairman McCarty noted that Steve Shaffer would now be representing the Department of Food of Agriculture on the Commission. Vice Chair Mello added his welcome.

5. Commissioner Comments/Announcements.

There were no Commissioner comments.

6. Attorney General's Report.

Dan Siegel introduced Matt Rodriguez, the new head of the Land Law section of the Attorney General's office.

7. Executive Director's Report.

Ms Aramburu said she had distributed a memo describing staff activities since the last meeting and noted that a new Pending Projects memo and memo describing CALFED Category III Grants in the Delta had been mailed to the Commission.

8. Comments on CALFED Stage 1A Actions: South Delta

Chairman McCarty said the Commission would consider and possibly adopt comments on CALFED Phase 1A actions in the South Delta (Contra Costa and San Joaquin Counties).

Ms Aramburu noted the Commission received a briefing at the November meeting from the CALFED staff. The matter was directed to the CALFED Subcommittee who met and approved the comments before the Commission.

Commissioner Broddrick, regarding the comment and the timing of the installation of the fish barrier and the other barriers, advised that the head of Old River barrier is critical to protection of endangered species and is part of restoration of the species. He noted that the timing might not always be as suggested in the letter. He said installation of the barrier supports the goals of the Commission to protect and enhance wildlife and their habitat in the Delta. He said the Commission had not discussed the issue of sequence of installation of the barriers and this letter suggests a sequence. Ms Aramburu asked if the letter should suggest the installation be part of the South Delta solution, rather than address each element. Commissioner Broddrick agreed.

Vice Chair Mello said the Committee had supported installation of the barriers as a package, not the sequencing of annual installation.

Commissioner Salmon said the head of Old River barrier diverts water as well as fish and all the barriers need to be installed simultaneously.

Commissioner Calone asked if Grantline Canal is dredged, what is the impact to agriculture; Commissioner Salmon there is concern that the South Delta project will not work without the Grantline barrier, and dredging of the Grantline Canal will only speed the movement of water through the area.

Commissioner Salmon suggested that the letter support "coordinated" installation.

Commissioner Broddrick agreed that the term "coordinated" would be acceptable.

Commissioner Shaffer suggested deleting a timeline and that installation should be coordinated "so as to not adversely impact the stages in the Delta".

Chairman McCarty noted the change would read "should be installed in coordination with installation of the water control barriers so as to not adversely impact local agriculture."

Commissioner Calone asked how the Commission will get feedback if the system is not working; Chairman McCarty said these are just comments on a proposed plan.

There was no public comment.

On a motion by Vice Chair Mello and a second by Commissioner Calone, the amended letter was adopted by unanimous voice vote.

9. Comments on CALFED Governance Proposal.

Chairman McCarty said the Commission would consider and possibly adopt comments on the Governance proposal to create a new agency to carry out the CALFED Program after the Record of Decision is final. He noted the creation of the proposed new entity would require State and federal legislation.

Ms Aramburu noted this matter was discussed at the November meeting and the matter referred to the CALFED Subcommittee, which met to address the proposed comments. The proposed comment support additional Delta representation on a regional agency that may be created to oversee the CALFED program.

Commissioner McGowan supports the proposal; and recommended that perhaps the Delta County representative be narrowed to someone sitting on the Commission.

Commissioner Coglianesse raised the issue because local government will be called upon to carry out many of the CALFED programs and had suggested it be local government statewide, not just Delta local governments. Ms Aramburu noted that CALFED Subcommittee narrowed the local government representative to the Delta

Counties. Commissioner Coglianese said she supported the change and would also support the idea of the local government representative being a Commission member.

Chairman McCarty said he supported including an elected local government official on the CALFED agency.

Commissioner Nottoli suggested the language be changed to support two local government representatives, a City and a County representative.

Commissioner Shaffer said CALFED is looking for broad direction for the CALFED governance agency, rather than the exact make-up. He said CALFED recognizes the need for balance. He said the concept of local government representation is important and suggested deleting any number and adding the word "strong".

Commissioner Curry said the suggestion for a Delta landowner is not clearly defined; Chairman McCarty suggested adding the Primary Zone of the Delta.

Commissioner McGowan said the intent is to include the local government perspective and would support any language which underscores that need; the more local government participation the better.

Commissioner Sanders suggested one or more local government officials from the five Delta counties and add the possibility that there may be more than one local government representation.

Commissioner McGowan supports City and County representation from the five Delta counties.

Commissioner Nottoli supports changing the letter to say "two or more".

Chairman McCarty said the recommended changes are: a "Primary Zone" landowner and two or more local government representatives.

Chairman McCarty opened the public hearing.

Chris Neudeck, KSN Engineering, said he supports Delta involvement in the CALFED program and is very concerned about the on-going levee maintenance program, and the need to provide habitat mitigation as a part of levee maintenance. He said the program is currently overseen by the Department of Fish and Game, the Department of Water Resources and the Reclamation Board. He said the CALFED proposal is to transfer oversight of the levee maintenance program for the 52 reclamation districts to the new CALFED agency. He asked that the Commission consider the implementation of habitat in the Delta if the CALFED Commission were to become involved with day to day certification of the habitat plans. He suggests the program should be left in the hands of DFG and DWR. He said he is concerned that

the Ecosystem Restoration Program seems to be a new separate entity, with DFG and DWR out of the picture.

On a motion by Vice Chair Mello and a second by Commissioner Mello, the draft letter with two amendments, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The Chair directed the staff to work with the CALFED Committee to develop comments, if necessary, regarding the levee maintenance program and implementation of the ERP. The matter would return at the March meeting.

10. Comments on the Proposed North Delta National Wildlife Refuge.

Chairman McCarty said the Commission would be briefed by Fish and Wildlife Service staff on the 47,500 acre preferred alternative located in Yolo and Solano Counties. He introduced Richard Hadley and Tom Harvey of the Service.

He asked for questions from the Commission on the staff report. Ms Aramburu noted that she had prepared a map showing the Legal Delta, the Primary Zone, and the preferred alternative.

Tom Harvey introduced other staff members and reviewed the preferred alternative (#5) for the proposed North Delta National Wildlife Area. He noted the project brings together programs including the Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture, CALFED, Section 1135; North American Wildlife Management Plan, Yolo Basin Wildlife Area; the Yolo County Grasslands Park; and the City of Davis Open Space Program. He said the project would protect flood conveyance in the Bypass and he noted that farming is becoming more difficult due to increasing flooding events. He reviewed land ownership and on-going projects. He reviewed the several commitments included in the environmental analysis. He stated the proposed action is setting an administrative boundary and does not establish a refuge. He said more planning and environmental review would be required prior to establishing a refuge, and still more planning and environmental review would be required prior to carrying out habitat restoration. He noted that mitigation banks and habitat conservation plans can be included in a refuge boundary and the Service can service as manager of habitat areas. He said the Service has a policy of obtaining the least ownership interest necessary to carry out a program, such as conservation easements and agricultural easements. Mr. Harvey noted that the comment period has been extended to February 22, 2000. He said Service would be drafting language to carry out additional commitments as a result of discussions during the review period. He believes the project will have local benefits and will enhance the existing programs and projects.

Chairman McCarty opened the public hearing.

Richard Hadley said the Service was asked to include a preferred alternative that provides most opportunities for coordinated management in the area, but the Service is evaluating all alternatives and no alternative.

Page Baldwin, who lives and farms on Egbert Tract, said he is concerned about the loss of prime agricultural land, seepage west of the Bypass Levee, the stability of the Ryer Island Ferry, impacts to his home, possible impacts to the Rio Vista Airport, and accommodation of existing mineral rights.

Mr. Harvey responded the environmental assessment is for a boundary only, a refuge would require willing sellers and funds for acquisition, additional environmental review, and additional hydrologic studies. He noted that other agencies have been looking at acquisition in the Egbert area. He said gas extraction could be accommodated.

Chris Neudeck, representing Prospect Island, said the Service should prepare an environmental impact statement, not an environmental assessment. He said he had brought photographs and exhibits on display. He said he is concerned about the cumulative affects of restoration projects. He said the issues about seepage and impacts to levees identified in the lawsuit over the environmental document for restoring Prospect Island would be issues if Egbert Tract were opened to tidal action. He said the landowners of Ryer Island have paid \$50,000 for engineering studies about the seepage issue; this type of effort should be carried out by the project proponents. He noted that the Reclamation Board addressed the issue of Prospect Island at its last meeting and deferred action because of the cumulative impacts of the overall proposed refuge. He supports additional studies prior to any decisions about the refuge.

Vice Chair Mello said the photos show impacts of seepage on an adjacent island and are very clear and vivid illustrations of impacts to agriculture.

Mr. Harvey said the proposal is not to flood Egbert Tract; it is a proposal to set a refuge boundary.

Chairman McCarty closed the public hearing and asked for Commission comments.

Commissioner McGowan said the Yolo County Board of Supervisors has held a workshop on the proposed refuge with the Farm Bureau and the Yolo Basin Foundation, and he has toured the site. He said there needs to be a coordinated planing effort between the Service, the County and others. He said Board is struggling with the issues and said the efforts to preservation of agricultural land in the site and cumulative impacts are key. He said he could be supportive if they approach this as a local project.

Commissioner Harris and he is concerned about the retirement of agricultural land near Rio Vista and the economic impacts to the local economy and the loss of tax

base. He said the project appears to be part of the CALFED program. He noted concern about possible future exportation of water to Southern California. He asked if there would be review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and asked if there could be an extension of the review period. He suggested having a public meeting in the Rio Vista area. He feels the preferred alternative is excessive. Mr. Hadley said the comment period has been extended until February 22 and at that time, the decision may be made to prepare an environmental impact statement. He said the project would not be evaluated under CEQA.

Commissioner McGowan said there is concern about the level of environmental review, and noted that an environmental impact statement would provide more information than the environmental assessment. He asked why the Service would not prepare an environmental impact statement. He said it's a matter of trust, and the public would trust additional analysis and studies more than the environmental assessment. Mr. Hadley explained options under NEPA for tiered environmental review and said many of the issues being raised involve long-term management. He said the current question is should a refuge be created and how big should it be. He noted all the commitments in the environmental assessment are legally binding. Commissioner McGowan said it's like agreeing to be a little bit pregnant. Mr. Hadley said the alternative would be to develop multiple scenarios for all the alternatives. The Service would prefer to select a site and then develop a management plan.

Commissioner Shaffer said establishing the refuge boundary will make farming more difficult to farm in the long run as lands are converted to habitat. The infill parcels will become "willing sellers". He said "rezoning" this large acreage to habitat/refuge uses will have a significant effect and should be evaluated in an environmental impact statement.

Vice Chair Mello asked if an environmental impact statement had been prepared for the Stone Lake National Wildlife Refuge that is only 18,000 acres; Mr. Harvey said yes. Vice Chair Mello pointed out the math error on p. v and vi. Vice Chair Mello asked about the loss of local tax revenues (p. vi); Mr. Harvey said there is a movement in Congress to reimburse 100% of lost tax revenues and noted that it is not appropriate to multiply the 75% and the 76%. He also commented that there has been development within the boundary of the Stone Lakes Refuge and thousands of acres have been planted in grapes.

Commissioner Calone expressed his concerns about the impacts to agriculture, and the proposed loss of 17,500 acres of prime farmland. He said that there are inconsistencies between what has been written about the project and what has been said orally. He also expressed concern about inclusion of lands near Rio Vista, and the impacts to the town and the farmers. Commissioner Calone said there are hunters in the area with floating blinds that might be affected, or asked to leave a refuge. He noted the proposal is for a massive refuge in a flood plain and on prime agricultural land, and adjacent to a City. He said he could not accept any of the proposed alternatives.

Commissioner Broddrick said Prospect Island was acquired first and the environmental documentation prepared second and he noted that the environmental document is being reviewed in the courts. He said the Service is only trying to set an administrative boundary for a new refuge and asked Mr. Harvey if any other similar action had included so many commitments by the Service. He asked the Commission to acknowledge the efforts made by the Service in the environmental assessment. He said that funds would have to be delegated by Congress before any lands could be acquired, and said that it would be years before the Refuge would be completed. He again noted the depth of discussions on this proposal.

Commissioner Cabaldon asked that the Service staff hold comments to the end of the Commission discussion.

Vice Chair Mello commented that the establishment of the Stone Lakes Refuge had resulted in the loss of funds to the North Delta Water Agency for water, and the Agency still has to pay the State of California for the water used in the Refuge. He said if the Refuge were fully built out, 25% of the lands in the Agency would be in the Refuge. Vice Chair Mello said he is concerned about the possible impacts to the Agency, and how cost would be offset in perpetuity. He noted this is an example of CALFED agencies carrying out CALFED goals with monies granted by CALFED. He said Liberty Island has been purchased with CALFED funds, and while the environmental assessment states the Service cannot acquire land until a refuge boundary has been set there is already some agreement that the Trust for Public Land will acquire and hold the land and then turn it over to the Service. He said the assessment states that additional water will not be consumed, however, wetland areas use more water than agricultural lands. He asked that the source of additional water be identified. He said the assessment states that the Service will jointly pursue funding for fish screens if needed; Vice Chair Mello believes that the financial burden of installing and maintaining future fish screens should lie with the Service for intakes in, adjacent to and near the proposed Refuge. He noted that CALFED staff has stated that CALFED would pay for installation and maintenance of screens in the South Delta. He said that the assessment states that landowners in and near the refuge can apply for "safe harbor". Vice Chair Mello believes that will be very expensive for the landowners. He said the assessment minimizes local fiscal impacts by citing figures for the entire County; the assessment does not address the cumulative impacts to agriculture in the Delta from recent and planned restoration projects; the assessment does not mention the North Delta Water Agency. He noted that the assessment does not address any traffic impacts associated with Refuge visitors (200,000 to 300,000 per year). He asked if the proposed acreage would go toward the CALFED restoration acreage and noted that in some cases the Refuge acreage of some habitats exceeds what is proposed by CALFED's ERP. Vice Chair Mello said the assessment does not mention that there is a lawsuit over the environmental document for the Prospect Island restoration project. He said the Commission has supported inclusion of buffers in new projects to protect existing agricultural uses; buffers are not addressed. The assessment says the area used to support 250 species, however the Bypass currently supports 239 species. He noted his concerns about how

the Bypass will operate and suggested that additional study should be carried out before a decision is made about the Refuge. He noted that there could be impacts downstream at Rio Vista. Vice Chair Mello said there should be acknowledgement of the existing habitat values on the agricultural lands which are slated for restoration to water-covered or wetland habitat. He noted that there are a lot of contradictions in the environmental assessment, the assessment does not go far enough and is inadequate, and recommended that a full environmental impact statement be prepared before any action is taken by the Service. He also noted the Service has not held any public hearings, only public workshops.

Chairman McCarty summarized that the Commission is being asked to support this administration action, a designation for further study. However, the document does include a lot of specificity--what will be done, how things will be done. He said there is concern from many that if the environmental assessment is approved, it will be the blueprint for the proposed Refuge without additional studies and analysis. He said he supports Vice Chair Mello's position that because of the level of specificity and the lack of quantitative measure of those impacts, the Commission should request preparation of an environmental impact statement.

Commissioner McGowan said his Board is still reviewing the proposal, however he noted that the staff report suggests the Commission should determine if the proposed Refuge is consistent with the Commission's Plan. He suggested the Service should work with the Commission's staff to bring the project closer to the Commission's Plan. He suggested that if there could be a closer match between the Commission's Plan and the proposed refuge, there could be agreement on the project. He said if there is no understanding of the project, there cannot be support of the project. He suggested that to gain his support, as a local government official, the State or federal agencies must go further than the required minimum. He said he is supposed to protect the lands in his County, but he has not seen enough to be able to support a project, much as he would like to.

Commissioner Harris mentioned the Rio Vista Airport and the possible need to extend the runway 1,000 feet to the east-northeast. He said he hopes a refuge would not interfere with such an expansion.

Commissioner Coglianese said the Service did not heed the Commission's comments in 1998 regarding protecting agriculture on prime soils and including buffers between existing agriculture and the refuge.

Commissioner Cabaldon, representing an urban area, said it's important that the Service has taken an interest in wildlife habitat in the Delta, and he would like to be able to support a refuge in the North Delta. He noted there are serious issues with the current proposal which need to be resolved. He said he's not sure if an environmental impact statement is the solution because there are other issues that need to be addressed such as recreational uses of the refuge, the coordination with the habitat conservation plans of the Counties, and others beyond the issue of the conversion of

prime agricultural land. He said the real point is the refuge proposal needs to be handled in a more collaborative way with local governments, the Commission's Plan and CALFED. He said it's a great idea to something in this regard, but there are a lot of other plans underway in the same area and we need to bring all the parties and projects together. He said as a means to bring the Service to the negotiating table, he could support requesting an environmental impact statement. He does not want to suggest that is the solution, he noted there are several points where the proposed refuge is not consistent with the Commission's Plan. He said its clear the proposal is not consistent with the Commission's Plan, but he would like to see a point by point analysis of consistency of the refuge with the Commission's Plan.

Commissioner Salmon said in the South Delta there is a lot of agency support for green belts and agricultural land protection until a proposal is submitted for development. He said he could not support a refuge proposal that would retire such a large amount of agricultural land.

Commissioner Nottoli said an environmental impact statement would provide information for a fuller dialog and more detailed examination of a proposed project. He said the Stone Lakes Refuge had an environmental impact statement. He said the proposed refuge is raising a number of issues, and to allow fuller discussion of the proposal he would support requesting an environmental impact statement.

Commissioner Curry noted there are about one million registered boats in California and said the boating public will want more information about the proposed project and how it would affect boating. He agreed that an environmental impact statement should be prepared and should address that issue.

Commissioner Shaffer said the issue of trust of CALFED is fundamental with this project. He said trust is built through open and honest dialog. He said the environmental assessment does not provide adequate discussion of the project. He said even if the law did not require preparation of an environmental impact statement, one should be prepared to build trust.

Mr. Harvey responded to Commission comments:

- There is an error in the Executive Summary, but the map is correct.
- The total acreage of prime agricultural land to be converted to habitat is 5,937 acres, primarily in Solano County.
- Existing navigable waterways would continue to be accessible for recreational uses.
- The interiors of the islands would allow expanded opportunities for boating, if tidal restoration were feasible.
- The Refuge would allow expanded opportunities for public use.
- The Safe Harbor agreements are a tool available to private landowners if they want to pursue them; the Service believes there are opportunities in the proposed project to alleviate the regulatory burden on landowners.

- Acreage restored to habitat in this project would count toward CALFED's restoration acreage totals.
- The project is not just a Service project, but brings together other projects that have been on going for some time.
- The proposed Refuge would not impact the operation of the Bypass and the analysis in the document that shows a slight increase was only to show the feasibility of some of the habitat restoration described in the environmental assessment. He agreed that any increase in flood levels would not be tolerated or approved by the Reclamation Board, the Corps of Engineers, or the Department of Water Resources.
- The Service agrees that agricultural land does provide habitat, that is the idea behind the agricultural easement program to support wildlife-friendly agriculture. Much of the agricultural land in the Bypass is unimproved; land which has never been leveled, with sloughs, swales, seasonal wetlands, and vernal pools. Much of the land would continue to be grazed.
- The public workshop process allows maximum solicitation of input from the public and from agencies on the proposed project.
- The proposed project is consistent with the Delta Protection Plan: the project avoids conversion of prime agricultural lands (Solano and Yolo Counties and agricultural easement program); the lands proposed for conversion to tidal habitat are subject to frequent flooding (Prospect Island).
- The planning process has been on-going since 1998; the Service is trying to be collaborative and the proposed project is the result of a lot of dialog and includes a lot of commitments to reinsure the public about key issues.

Mr. Hadley noted that the strongest level of interest is for the preferred alternative (#5) and Alternative #2. He said that if an environmental impact statement is prepared, some of the alternatives might be deleted from further consideration. He asked for input as to which alternatives should be studied further.

Commissioner Calone asked if lower areas are permanently flooded (Liberty and Prospect Island), what would be the impact to the flood capacity of the Bypass. He suggested that issue be studied.

Chairman McCarty agreed with Commissioner McGowan that the principal duty of the Commission is to protect the Delta and to do that the proposed project should conform to the Commission's Plan. He said staff had made a good first cut. He said the Commission seemed to support preparation of an environmental impact statement to more fully address issues that have been raised. He suggested that would help raise the level of trust for this very large project in the Delta. He said the map shows that the proposed project is about 10% of the Primary Zone of the Delta. He suggested that staff include those types of comments in an advisory letter to the Service.

Vice Chair Mello asked that the comments specifically state that an environmental impact statement be prepared.

Commissioner Cabaldon moved that the Commission determine that the proposed refuge is not consistent with the Commission's Land Use and Resource Management Plan for the Primary Zone of the Delta and direct staff to prepare comments and authorize the Chair to approve and sign a letter which documents those areas of inconsistency, articulates the other concerns expressed at the meeting and requests preparation of an environmental impact statement by the Service. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Mello. The motion was approved by a voice vote with 10 ayes; 1 nay (Broddrick) and 3 abstains (McGowan, Brean, and Sanders).

Chairman McCarty recognized Chief Deputy of Department of Water Resources, Steve Macaulay.

Vice Chair Mello mentioned that on page C-13 of the environmental assessment, a discussion of water quality indicates there could be impacts to salinity in water quality but the size of the impacts have not yet been determined. He noted that DWR has a contract to provide water to the North Delta Water Agency and this project could impact management of the State's water management. Mr. Macaulay said the project looks good, but there are some important details that need to be addressed. He said the in the North Delta, lands have riparian water rights and those rights would go with the land.

11. Consideration of 1999 Annual Report.

Chairman McCarty said the Commission would review and possibly adopt the annual report for 1999 for submittal to the Governor and the Legislature. Ms Aramburu noted two minor corrections.

Commissioner Coglianese noted one minor correction on page 9 and Commissioner Sanders noted one minor correction on page 14.

Chairman McCarty opened the floor to public comments.

Dick Taylor, RD 501, Ryer Island, suggested the Commission spend the night on Ryer Island on an evening of "Warning Stage" when the island is subject to being covered by six to eight feet of water. He said his concern is that the proposed refuge in the Bypass will be filled up with sediment and plant materials and that flood threat would increase on nearby islands.

On a motion by Commissioner Calone and a second by Vice Chair Mello, the annual report was approved unanimously.

12. Consideration of Propositions 12 and 13 (Water and Parks).

Chairman McCarty said the Commission would review and possibly adopt positions on two Propositions on the March 2000 ballot. Ms Aramburu described the two propositions and noted that the Commission does have the ability to take a position on the propositions.

Commissioner Broddrick asked if state officers should abstain from a vote on the proposed propositions; Dan Siegel said the Commission and any Commission member could take a position on a measure. The Commission may not expend state funds to promote one position or another. The Commission may distribute completed unbiased information or express the Commission's position.

Vice Chair Mello said he supports Proposition 13, but is disappointed that it will not build surface water storage. Commissioner Brean noted that there is no opposition to Proposition 12, and funds would help defray costs of deferred maintenance, and about \$900 million dollars to local and regional park districts.

There was no public comment.

On a motion by Commissioner Nottoli and a second by Commissioner Brean the Commission voted to support both Propositions 12 and 13, with a no vote by Commissioner Calone and Commissioner Sanders abstaining.

13. Adjourn.